

U.S. Department of Education
2009 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) ☐ Elementary ☐ Middle ☒ High ☐ K-12 ☐ Other
☐ Charter ☒ Title I ☐ Magnet ☐ Choice

Name of Principal: Mrs. Elizabeth Burr

Official School Name: Sullivan Creek Elementary

School Mailing Address:
16331 Hidden Valley Road
Sonora, CA 95370-7926

County: Tuolumne State School Code Number*: 55723556107445

Telephone: (209) 532-9756 Fax: (209) 533-8557

Web site/URL: http://www.ccreek.k12.ca.us/ E-mail: lburr@ccreek.k12.ca.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

(Principal's Signature) Date _____

Name of Superintendent*: Ms. Britta Skavdahl

District Name: Curtis Creek Elementary Tel: (209) 533-1083

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mr. Dan Parks

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date _____

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

Original signed cover sheet only should be mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as USPS Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2008-2009 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2003.
6. The nominated school has not received the No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, or 2008.
7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district: 2 Elementary schools
 Middle schools
 Junior high schools
 High schools
 Other
2 **TOTAL**

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 5833

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 4943

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- ☐ Urban or large central city
☐ Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
☐ Suburban
☐ Small city or town in a rural area
☒ Rural

4. 10 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	29	17	46	7			0
K	19	13	32	8			0
1	19	16	35	9			0
2	14	16	30	10			0
3	13	16	29	11			0
4	19	8	27	12			0
5	4	15	19	Other			0
6			0				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							218

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

2 % American Indian or Alaska Native
2 % Asian
3 % Black or African American
15 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
77 % White
1 % Two or more races
100 % Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 179 %

This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	13
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	12
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	25
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	14
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	1.786
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	178.571

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 5 %

Total number limited English proficient 11

Number of languages represented: 1

Specify languages:

Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 47 %

Total number students who qualify: 103

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-price school meals program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 3 %

Total Number of Students Served: 7

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

<u>1</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>1</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>0</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>5</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
Support staff	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>
Total number	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 17 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Daily student attendance	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Daily teacher attendance	99%	99%	98%	99%	99%
Teacher turnover rate	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

Daily student attendance averages have been estimated for the years 2006/2007, 2005/2006, 2004/2005 and 2003/2004 due to a change in our school information software. Numbers were estimated by reviewing individual teachers' monthly attendance records and percentages were estimated.

Daily teacher attendance averages were estimated for all years listed above. Our school district does not document this in any formal way. Averages were estimated by reviewing past substitute record books.

Teacher turnover rates were based on retirement and layoff notice information.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2008 are doing as of the Fall 2008.

Graduating class size	0	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0	%
Enrolled in a community college	0	%
Enrolled in vocational training	0	%
Found employment	0	%
Military service	0	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	0	%
Unknown	0	%
Total	100	%

PART III - SUMMARY

With a cursory look at Sullivan Creek School, you will find a broad circle of community (parents, teachers, students, classified staff, community volunteers, superintendent and governing board) focused on student achievement. A closer look will reveal that all members of this community are dedicated to providing a high quality, intensive and strategic academic program for all students. Our Sullivan Creek School vision statement says it all: “The Sullivan Creek School community is committed to working together to provide a positive learning environment and high quality instruction that promotes life-long learning for all.”

Since our school is so small, we depend on each other for support in all areas. Our school’s commitment to providing a high quality education begins in preschool. Our school has housed a State Funded Preschool program on our campus for the last 10 years. Our commitment to early childhood education and its importance upon the academic achievement is apparent in our full day preschool and Kindergarten programs.

Sullivan Creek School is the hub for its surrounding rural community. Students, families, staff and the community look to the school as the central center for learning, social and academic focus, sports and extra-curricular fun throughout the school year. Student activities are shared with the community through holiday concerts, drama productions, the Jog-a-Thon and Spell-a-Thon fundraisers, science fair projects, teddy bear picnics, assemblies, whole school skating events. Fund raising events also take place for a variety of needs, including community (i.e., Thanksgiving and Christmas food baskets), local (acorn donations to the Rose Wolf Wildlife Preservation facility), and international (supplies sent to local soldiers serving in Iraq). These activities create a positive learning environment with a culture of collaboration and respect. These experiences also teach the students that it is important to give back to their community. These and many other activities would not be possible without our highly involved parent and school partnership.

So what is it that makes Sullivan Creek School deserving of this award? If you look at the campus alone, you would see that the physical environment is a unique setting for a school. Situated in a meadow, with record breaking large oak trees and a camp like feeling is not enough to make our school deserving of the National Blue Ribbon Award. It is the staff, who truly makes this a special school. Each and every member of this staff, both classified and certificated, know and believe that they are here for one purpose and one purpose only, to move kids in a positive direction. That is done not only in the classroom, but also outside of the classroom as well, by being there for our students and each other. It is the parent and school partnership who truly make this a special school. Without their support, we could not provide the enrichment activities and day to day academic support that our students require. We are a family; we all look out for each other and support each other, from students to teachers, to bus drivers, to custodial staff. Parents and staff work together to build this school community, in tough times and in celebratory times we stand united. We will continue to build this relationship, to better meet the needs of our students and to build our environment. We are one, working together to create a better future for our children and to realize our school vision where we are committed to working together to provide a positive learning environment and high quality instruction that promotes life long learning for all.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

California measures student proficiency of state content standards through the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program. The program consists of the California Standards Test (CST), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA). The CST is the primary assessment for general education students and the CMA and CAPA are reserved as a means for alternative measurement. These criterion-reference exams classify students, grades two through eleven, into five performance levels: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic. More information regarding the STAR program can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/>.

Students are given scores of Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic or Far Below Basic on their CST. This is based upon performance on their assessment. A score of Advanced on the CST indicates that the student consistently meets and often exceeds the standard, a score of Proficient indicates the student regularly meets the grade level standard, a score of Basic indicates a student is beginning to meet the standard, a score of Below Basic indicates the student is not meeting the grade level standard, and Far Below Basic indicates a student is working significantly below grade level.

Students with IEP's may receive accommodations or modifications to the test if agreed upon by the IEP team. These students also have the option of taking the California Modified Assessment (CMA) or the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA).

Another component of the testing and accountability system in California is the Academic Performance Index (API). The API is a numeric score between 200 and 1,000 reflecting a school's performance result on the CST as part of the STAR program. The school's API score can then be compared to schools statewide and to schools with similar demographic characteristics. A score of 800 is currently the target for all schools in the state of California.

Since the inception of the API ranking system Sullivan Creek School has always had a score above 800. This indicates that the instruction that occurs at Sullivan Creek School benefits all students. Our staff prides itself on maintaining high expectations for all students, having the confidence in each and every child that they can and will meet our expectations and the ability to provide an enriching and challenging curriculum for all students.

The STAR scores over the past 5 years at Sullivan Creek have been fairly consistent in the areas of ELA and Mathematics. Eighty percent of the students in the fifth grade in 2004 scored either Proficient or Advanced on the CST in ELA, while 81 percent of fifth grade students scored Proficient or Advanced on the CST in 2008. Mathematics is where we have shown dramatic improvement when looking at the fifth grade scores. In 2004, only 63 percent of our fifth grade students were scoring Proficient or Advanced on the Mathematics CST, while in 2008, 81 percent of our students scored Proficient or Advanced on the CST.

If you look solely at our students who qualify for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), you will see that over half of our students are scoring Proficient or above in English Language Arts and over 65% are scoring Proficient or above in Mathematics.

As indicated by our CST scores many of our students are working in the Advanced, Proficient or Basic range. We have relatively few students working in the Below Basic range and virtually no students in the Far Below Basic range.

This data indicates our students are achieving, our teachers are correctly teaching and we are sending our students on to their next academic endeavor with the skills they need to be successful.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Each fall, the Principal, School Site Council and the staff reviews STAR data from the prior year to plan intervention programs. We, as School Site Council, continue to review classroom based assessment data as the year progresses to make changes in programs or to address needs as they occur.

Sullivan Creek School plans professional development activities based upon a systematic professional development plan which is built upon our school goals, which are based upon our school district and board goals. Utilizing our school goals, the School Site Council determines performance targets for improving student achievement in the areas of English/Language Arts, Mathematics and Science based upon data (STAR scores and classroom based assessments) reviewed throughout the school year. Materials, instruction and training are aligned with content standards. Both teachers and instructional aides attend professional development. Recently, we contracted with a past staff member, who is now a trainer for the Governor's Reading Initiative, to work with our staff in the areas of intervention strategies, fluency and decoding. This was an extremely beneficial training and was derived from discussions with the staff after reviewing data and determining the need to focus in these specific areas. After participating in these trainings, our staff decided that they should attend the AB 470 training over the summer.

Data analysis drives our instructional decisions. Prior to the school year starting, teachers review STAR data from their incoming students as well as the previous year's class to look for trends as well as areas of strengths and weaknesses with an eye toward improving teaching. Teachers also collaborate across grade levels to prepare for the upcoming school year. Students new to the school are assessed prior to school starting to give the teachers an idea on areas of strengths/ weaknesses prior to the start of instruction.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

With each individual student as our focus, we conduct one-on-one conferencing between Principal and teacher to improve instruction and intervention possibilities. Assessment data is reviewed at these individual meetings for both ELA and Mathematics. Teachers also educate parents that a Basic score on the STAR test does not indicate passing the grade level standards. Released STAR test questions at each grade are shared with parents so they understand the rigor of our standards and why our grade level expectations are so high. Students and parents are informed that in order to meet grade level standards they must be performing at or above the Proficient score. Progress reports are sent home every eight weeks to inform parents of progress through the standards. Students who are not meeting the standards or are struggling will have more frequent home/school communication via notes/phone calls home.

Grade level brochures are shared with parents and provide a clear description of how state standards are tied to grade-level expectations and curriculum. Progress reports are issued at eight-week intervals as the school year progresses. Parent teacher conferences are held three times during the year. These formal conferences are scheduled to accommodate the parents. Many frequent informal conferences between parents and teachers occur after or before the school day begins. Often times parents and teachers hold informal conferences after school as they pick their children up from school. This is frequently a time for parents to network informally and gain information regarding the day's activities, future events and happenings at school. Standards based report cards go home each trimester and progress reports are issued three times a year as well. Our report cards identify the essential standards at each grade level. Performance is evaluated based on an Advanced, Proficient, Basic and Below Basic scale.

4. Sharing Success:

Sharing our success begins at home. Each year our Academic Performance Index (API) is over 800, the state's benchmark, we have a school wide celebration, sponsored by 2 community members who have supported our school in a variety of ways. At this celebration we thank our students and staff for their hard work and continued

success in the academic arena. Students and staff are rewarded with a special treat and an extended recess period, which is enjoyed by all.

STAR scores are also published in the local newspaper, The Union Democrat, and shared with the community. Our superintendent also holds a district wide meeting at the beginning of the school year to share STAR scores. The API score is shared in our monthly newsletter and a comprehensive report is given at a fall board meeting.

An open invitation is extended to other local school districts to join in our staff development. We often have other school districts visit our classrooms to observe high quality teaching.

We also host at least 5 to 6 student teachers from the Cal State Teach program every year. The Cal State Teach program is a cutting edge teacher education program which requires individuals to spend 4 semesters observing and teaching in the classroom environment. We have become a cluster school for this innovative program, providing a nurturing environment for beginning teachers to learn the craft.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

A significant and ongoing practice at our site is a focus on the essential standards indicated in the Frameworks for English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, Science and Social Studies as we align our teaching to these standards. With guidance and facilitation from the administration, we use staff development “Buy Back” days, early release Professional Collaboration Days (PC days) to monitor and improve the academic program of students by analyzing both classroom based and standardized assessment data. For example, at a series of recent PC days (which are held the first and third Wednesday of each month), grade levels met in their professional learning communities (PLC’s) to determine what the essential standards were at each grade level in Mathematics. They used the information from the STAR Blueprints, the Mathematics Framework (2005), and data from our most recent STAR scores to assist in this discussion. Once these essential standards were identified, grade level teams developed a pacing calendar to ensure these concepts were taught in a sequential manner prior to the end of the school year. They then highlighted in their Teacher’s Guides these essential standards, to remind themselves of the importance of the standard when they arrive at that lesson throughout the school year.

As the year progresses, students are monitored using curriculum embedded assessments focused on fluency, comprehension, spelling, vocabulary and grammar and are based on the teaching that has occurred during the week. Grade level teams review the data from these assessments during their common preparation time and instructional strategies and intervention techniques are brainstormed then included in the action plan. PLC team meetings occur weekly with all parties focused on student achievement.

Providing a well rounded program is an essential component of Sullivan Creek School. Students in grades 4 and 5 are provided science instruction on a daily basis by a certificated science specialist. The focus of this instruction provides a standards based hands-on approach to science. Students enjoy the opportunity to explore earth, physical and life sciences by exploring the world around them.

Teachers in grades K-3 often work together to provide enriching science and social studies opportunities. Team teaching and integrating curriculum occurs daily to provide a high quality level of instruction in science and social studies.

Our staff truly believes that each and every child is capable of achieving at high levels. This is exemplified through our continuing effort to communicate clear expectations to all students and parents. This district has formally adopted the state standards as our common focus in all academic areas and standards for ELA and Mathematics are posted in all classrooms. All adopted curriculum is state approved and report cards are aligned with the standards.

Creative arts, strong academics and learning through involvement are at the heart of our children's educational experiences in grades K-5. The Sonora area is a highly artistic community, which has a high expectation of quality arts programs within the school environment. Currently, our students in grades K-3 receive weekly instruction from a music specialist. The focus of this instruction is to instill a love of music, an understanding of rhythm and movement and to learn note reading as well as enjoy the opportunity to play a variety of instruments using the ORFF methodology. Our school district supports our participation in the Arts Reach to Schools program which is facilitated by the Central Sierra Arts Council. This organization focuses on bringing artists into the school environment. Through this program we have had the opportunity to attend live theatre productions, create pieces of pottery and art work and participate in dramatic performances of their own.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

Mathematics is an area in which our students excel. We have been using the Saxon Mathematics program for more than 10 years and have found great success. Many of our students easily move into Algebra in the 8th grade. The Saxon Mathematics program is an incremental approach to teaching mathematics. The standards are mastered through small increments followed by integrated practice and strategically placed assessments. The philosophy of this program is "Time to learn, time to process and time to practice" which our students seem to respond to in a positive way.

Our scores prove our success. Before we used the Saxon Mathematics program only 30 percent of our students were scoring at the 50th percentile on the standards based test. Now, over 70 percent of our students score at or above grade level.

Another strategy our teachers use to ensure success in mathematics is to accelerate students who need an additional challenge. This differentiated instruction is initiated by looking at the students STAR test score in mathematics. If the student scores in the advanced range, the student is given a placement test to determine the correct grade placement. If the student's placement test indicates that he/she should be in the higher level math class, and the parents support this decision, the student will be accelerated to the next grade level. Currently, we have fifth grade students working in the sixth grade math book.

Our school prides itself on our high level of academic achievement. We also provide many enriching opportunities in all other curricular areas. Our students in grades 4 and 5 have a science specialist who instructs them in science every day, and our K-3 students have a music specialist throughout the week.

4. Instructional Methods:

We believe each student at Sullivan Creek School can be successful and perform at or above state standards regardless of physical needs, economic background, social/emotional challenges, or individual learning needs. All staff members understand that they have the same charge and the same goals for all of our students; high academic achievement. We stand with our arms linked.

During the school day, our staff uses a variety of instructional strategies to ensure student achievement. Some of these strategies include direct instruction techniques and differentiated instruction. All students in grades K, 1 and 2 are taught using a systematic, explicit phonics based reading program. This instruction occurs in a direct instruction setting, with teachers focusing on time on task, engagement in the activity, providing practice and reinforcing learning to ensure the transfer of knowledge from long-term to short-term memory. Also, all students in each grade level have a period of the day called independent work time. This is an opportunity for students to work on their own, without interruption. Many of the tasks assigned to them during this time are individualized. It also gives the teacher an opportunity to work individually or in small groups to differentiate instruction, based on the data from classroom assessments.

Recently, our staff participated in the AB 470 training, which strengthened many of our teaching techniques. Our staff has also participated in differentiated instruction training, sponsored by our GATE consortium, focusing on increasing academic achievement of all students using this strategy. Staff development is driven by our focus on curriculum, instruction and data analysis. Our principal has also taken the AB 430 training to become more current in instruction, technology and school leadership.

5. Professional Development:

Sullivan Creek School plans professional development activities based upon a systematic professional development plan which in turn is built upon our school goals, which are based upon our school district and board goals (like a pyramid). Utilizing our school goals, the School Site Council determines performance targets

for improving student achievement in the areas of English/Language Arts, Mathematics and Science. They are based upon data (STAR scores and classroom based assessments) reviewed throughout the school year. The staff and the School Site Council monitor student progress and identify students' needs utilizing a variety of assessment data. Materials, instruction and training are aligned with content standards.

Both teachers and instructional aides attend professional development. Standards-based instruction is important in our district and all training is scrutinized for the value of instruction, coordination with our adopted textbooks and alignment to state standards, frameworks and guidelines. All training is geared toward improving student achievement. Professional development is subject to the Principal's approval, based on the Single School Plan (SSP) goals. Our SSP identified the need for staff development in English/Language Arts, Mathematics and Science. Staff input is sought regarding staff development. Instructional aides are trained in all curricular areas and instructional strategies as well as behavior management techniques.

Data analysis drives our instructional decisions. Prior to the school year starting, teachers review STAR data from their incoming students as well as the previous year's class. They look for trends including areas of strengths and weaknesses with an eye toward improving teaching. Teachers also collaborate across grade levels to prepare for the upcoming school year. Students new to the school are assessed prior to school starting to give the teachers an idea on areas of strengths/ weaknesses before beginning instruction.

6. School Leadership:

Since our school is so small, our leadership team is comprised of our staff: Superintendent, Principal and 9 full time teachers. We work collaboratively on all major decision making issues, from developing a school vision to making recommendations for school goals that incorporate into our SSP. Much of this decision-making occurs at staff meetings or PC days. Our school vision statement is posted in each classroom and shared with all through our Parent Handbook which is given out at the beginning of every school year. The core of the school vision was developed by our staff, both classified and certificated with input from our Parent Cub and the School Site Council. While our school vision was developed a few years ago, it is reviewed and revised yearly and shared with the entire school community at the beginning of year in our Back to School folders.

Our principal has been on our school site for the past 10 years. This longevity has not only created a stable learning environment for the staff and students, it has continued to provide the Sullivan Creek School campus with a family like environment. The leadership that this individual has created has been one to motivate and nurture growth and development from both staff and students. While the focus continues to be on student achievement, decisions are always made with what is best for the students in mind.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 2

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: ETS

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	63	48	64	57
% Advanced	14	21	20	32	11
Number of students tested	28	33	25	28	37
Percent of total students tested	100	100	96	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	30	56	42	55	54
% Advanced	20	19	25	17	15
Number of students tested	10	16	12	13	13
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Only sub group with 10 or more students is the economically disadvantaged group. Some years there were less than 10 in this group, this is indicated by a 0 in the box. Scores were not broken down into advanced and proficient, only proficient plus.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 2

Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	51	60	50	36
% Advanced	7	12	16	18	14
Number of students tested	28	33	25	28	37
Percent of total students tested	100	100	96	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	40	38	58	46	31
% Advanced	0	6	25	15	15
Number of students tested	10	16	12	13	13
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Only sub group with 10 or more students is the economically disadvantaged group. Some years there were less than 10 in this group, this is indicated by a 0 in the box. Scores were not broken down into advanced and proficient, only proficient plus.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: ETS

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	54	69	71	60
% Advanced	33	23	26	24	26
Number of students tested	33	26	23	35	38
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	97	92
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	36	67	60	57	43
% Advanced	14	33	20	14	7
Number of students tested	14	15	10	14	14
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Only sub group with 10 or more students is the economically disadvantaged group. Some years there were less than 10 in this group, this is indicated by a 0 in the box. Scores were not broken down into advanced and proficient, only proficient plus.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3

Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: Educational Testing Systems

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	39	39	31	40	39
% Advanced	15	4	9	11	21
Number of students tested	33	26	23	35	38
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	97	92
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	36	40	30	21	21
% Advanced	0	7	10	0	7
Number of students tested	14	15	10	14	14
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Only sub group with 10 or more students is the economically disadvantaged group. Some years there were less than 10 in this group, this is indicated by a 0 in the box. Scores were not broken down into advanced and proficient, only proficient plus.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: ETS

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	69	68	76	53
% Advanced	42	23	17	32	11
Number of students tested	24	26	29	25	19
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	96	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	64	55		
% Advanced	38	18	18		
Number of students tested	13	11	11		
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Only sub group with 10 or more students is the economically disadvantaged group. Some years there were less than 10 in this group, this is indicated by a 0 in the box. Scores were not broken down into advanced and proficient, only proficient plus.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: ETS

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	65	55	56	63
% Advanced	38	27	31	32	26
Number of students tested	24	26	29	25	19
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	96	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	55	55		
% Advanced	38	18	18		
Number of students tested	13	11	11		
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Only sub group with 10 or more students is the economically disadvantaged group. Some years there were less than 10 in this group, this is indicated by a 0 in the box. Scores were not broken down into advanced and proficient, only proficient plus.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: ETS

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	58	74	77	63
% Advanced	29	23	52	29	13
Number of students tested	21	26	23	21	31
Percent of total students tested	95	100	100	91	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		55			
% Advanced		9			
Number of students tested		11			
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Only sub group with 10 or more students is the economically disadvantaged group. Some years there were less than 10 in this group, this is indicated by a 0 in the box. Scores were not broken down into advanced and proficient, only proficient plus.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5

Test: CST

Edition/Publication Year: updated annually

Publisher: ETS

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	50	70	66	80
% Advanced	19	19	35	33	40
Number of students tested	21	26	23	21	30
Percent of total students tested	95	100	100	91	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		45			
% Advanced		9			
Number of students tested		11			
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. (specify subgroup):					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Only sub group with 10 or more students is the economically disadvantaged group. Some years there were less than 10 in this group, this is indicated by a 0 in the box. Scores were not broken down into advanced and proficient, only proficient plus.